

United States provides that this Congress, this Federal Government, has the authority to regulate interstate commerce—for the purpose of avoiding a State law to help a minor child get an abortion without the knowledge of their loving parents, who are raising the child and will have to raise them in the future, they are guilty a Federal offense.

I think that is perfectly sound constitutionally and something we should do. It is past time we do it. I would urge my colleagues to consider this. If there is one circumstance in which we should be most concerned about abortion, it is that of the young lady I described who testified at our hearing. Crystal Lane was impregnated and having sex with an older man when she was 12 years of age, and had an abortion at 13 years of age, and her parent did not know about it. How did it happen? The young man's mother and young man got together and secreted her across State lines to have an abortion, so he would not be found out, so he would not be prosecuted for statutory rape. This was not done out of any interest in the child's welfare.

That is a very real problem that should not continue. We have the ability to do something about it. I urge my colleagues to study this act and to make sure we stop those who would usurp State law, usurp parental rights, and damage children without the knowledge of their parents.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

(The remarks of Mr. WYDEN are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. WYDEN. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I support S. 403, the Child Custody Protection Act. This bill is a commonsense measure that says simply that families, parents, and children are important in America and that we will respect them and protect them. The bill also demonstrates the importance of respecting our citizens who have spoken in State after State by the adoption of parental notification and parental consent requirements before a minor child can be subjected to invasive medical procedures with both physical and emotional consequences.

The Child Custody Protection Act would make it a Federal misdemeanor to transport a minor across State lines to obtain an abortion, in order to circumvent a home State law requiring notification of one or both parents prior to an abortion.

This bill does not permit the prosecution of the child or his parents, but it does permit the prosecution of outside third parties who would interfere with the parent-child relationship in order to further a political or ideological agenda.

In addition to criminal penalties, the bill allows any parent who suffers harm from a violation of this act may seek and obtain an appropriate civil remedy.

At a time when children in public schools cannot obtain so much as an aspirin from a school nurse without parental consent, America has overwhelmingly insisted that before permitting minors to undergo a major medical procedure, such as an abortion, their parents should consent or at the very least, be notified. Thirty-four States have enacted parental consent or notification laws. Parental notification is supported by 83 percent of the American people.

Yet, too often, outside third parties have intentionally sought to circumvent these profamily State laws and invade the parent-child relationship by transporting children across State lines for the purpose of having an abortion.

This bill will serve as a real deterrent to such efforts. It reaffirms the parent-child relationship which is so important to the overwhelming majority of Americans. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

I yield back.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

INTERNET NEUTRALITY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have already announced that I will do everything I can to block Senate consideration of the major overhaul of the telecommunications laws until it contains language to ensure there cannot be discrimination on the Internet.

Last week, I outlined a number of examples of the kind of discrimination that could take place unless there is language known as Net neutrality in the legislation. I am going to give additional examples this morning of what will happen if discrimination is allowed on the Net. I also intend to start laying out answers to some of the most frequently asked questions about Net neutrality.

The major phone and cable companies that are now spending enormous sums trying to prevent Net neutrality so outspend the folks who share my views that I think it is important for the Senate to get a sense of what is going on. That is why it is my intent to come to the floor of the Senate again and again and again to outline what is at stake with respect to ensuring that the Internet is kept free of discrimination.

Let me begin by first addressing this question of what exactly is Net neutrality. If you listen to some of the so-called experts about communications, they would suggest this is so complicated, so arcane, so difficult for any-

body to understand, you ought to let the lawyers and the lobbyists sort this out. Of course, that is traditionally what has gone on in this field. You have lawyers and lobbyists being paid very handsomely to battle it out with each other, usually in Washington, DC, or in courtrooms across the country.

Somehow, the typical person, the typical citizen, who has become empowered using the Internet, does not get to participate in these discussions. I will tell you, Mr. President, I do not think the American people are going to buy that any longer. The Internet, which, of course, has opened up so many doors for our citizens in terms of health care and business opportunities, education, and culture, has also ensured they get a lot of information about these communications debates that used to be reserved for lawyers and lobbyists.

The people of this country—and the hundreds and hundreds of organizations that want to keep the Internet discrimination free—are no longer going to accept a notion that a handful of insiders in Washington, DC, can have these debates about the future of the communications systems they depend on, and that the people of this country will have to take what these so-called experts decide. So this is going to be a debate, in my view, that is going to be driven by the grassroots of this country, by thousands of people getting involved and coming to their legislators, and others, to talk about the future of telecommunications—why so much communication power is concentrated in so few hands.

I am going to try to advance this debate here on the floor of the Senate every so often so we can make sure somebody is getting the message out about what is at stake, other than those big cable and phone companies that seem to be spending almost \$150 for every \$1 spent by folks who share my views.

The first question I want to talk about this morning is what exactly is Net neutrality? It is not that complicated. It is a pretty straightforward proposition. What Net neutrality means is you cannot discriminate on the Internet. The people who are against Net neutrality—I call them "the discriminators" because that is their agenda—want to discriminate. They want to be in a position to play favorites. They want to say: We will give certain people a good deal, both in terms of service and all the considerations that go into folks making their choices on line.

I do not think we should have that kind of discrimination. I think it ought to be, as it is today, possible for our citizens to go with their browser where they want to go, when they want to go, and everybody would be treated equally. That is the way it works today. I do not think there ought to be any changes.

Today, somebody pays a fee to get on the Net. They go where they want,